REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 26-29 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 26-29 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1 is amended.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action dated 4/4/2007 indicates insufficient antecedent basis for the term "search" (as opposed to search session).

Applicant amends Claim 1 line 9 to recite a search session and line 10 to recite a search during a search session. Applicant submits that this amendment cures the antecedent basis issue. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claim 26.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 1-3, 9-12, 26-27, and 29 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152190 to Biebesheimer et al. (Biebesheimer) view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,606 to Fries et al. (Fries). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that the cited art of Biebesheimer operates in a fashion that uses historical user interactions as part of a scheme which can generate a response set that are most relevant to a user's query. This differs from the invention expressed in amended Claim 1 where a context-dependent evaluation of search results acquired during the single search session is conducted, where the evaluation is based at least in part on the determined context data and the determined user feedback data acquired during the single search session.

Applicant further amends independent Claim 1 to indicate that determining explicit user feedback derived from at least one question to the user involves a question to the user

regarding the usefulness to a user of the response data. Applicant finds support for this amendment in paragraphs 0050, 0059-0060 and Table 1 of the as-filed specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Biebesheimer nor Fries teaches a method performed in a single search session that uses explicit user feedback data concerning the usefulness of the results to the user along with all of the other elements of amended independent Claim 1.

Biebesheimer teaches a novel mechanism for providing a response set based on user queries and derived user contexts and modifying output response sets in accordance with different user contexts and user interactions as they change over time. (see Biebesheimer, paragraph 0002). Biebesheimer also teaches that the adaptive indexing process is an off-line process that uses feedback from previous user interactions. (see Biebesheimer, paragraph 0019). This contrast with amended Claim 1 which uses both implicit and explicit feedback during a single search session. Fries teaches soliciting a search query from a user (See Fries, Abstract). Examples of these additional search queries appear on Figures 18 and 19 of Fries which indicate solicitations for additional but different searches. Fries fails to teach soliciting explicit user feedback as to the usefulness to the user of the response of the query results that are acquired during a single search session.

Since neither Biebesheimer nor Fries thoroughly teaches all elements of amended Claim 1, then the combination of Biebesheimer and Fries cannot render obvious amended Claim 1 user 35 U.S.C. §103(a) via MPEP §2143.03. Specifically the combination of Biebesheimer and Fries fails to teach at least the Claim 1 element of "determining user feedback data describing said search, the user feedback data including implicit user feedback derived from the user behavior data and explicit user feedback derived from at least one question to the user regarding the usefulness to a user of the response data and the user response to the at least one question in combination with the other claim elements during a single search session. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) rejection of Claim 1 and it dependent claims 2-3, 9-12, 26-27, and 29.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 5-8 and 17-20 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152190 to Biebesheimer et al. (Biebesheimer) view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,606 to Fries et al. (Fries) in further view of http://Whatis.techtarget.com. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based at least on the dependence of Claims 5-8 and 17-20 on patentably distinct Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) rejection of Claims 5-8 and 17-20.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claim 28 stands rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152190 to Biebesheimer et al. (Biebesheimer) view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,606 to Fries et al. (Fries) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,579 to Hosken. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based at least on the dependence of Claim 28 on patentably distinct Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) rejection of Claim 28.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the amendments and remarks presented above. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited because the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 3, 2007

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439